Aristotle, that seem to have so rank a smell 'of Atheism ? Certainly those mongrel and biform animals, that are said to have sprung up out of the earth by chance, look as if they were more akin to Democritus than Empedocles; and probably "it is the fault of the copies, that it is read otherwise, there being no other philosdpher that I know of, that could ever fiod any such thing in Empedocles's poems.* But for the rest, if Aristotle do not misrepresent Empedocles, as he often doth Plato, then it must be granted, that he being a mechanical physiologer, as well as theolo-ger, did something too much indulge to fortuitous mechanism; which seems to bean extravagancy, that mechanical philosophers and Atomists have been always more or less subject too. But Aristotle doth not charge Empedocles with resolving all things? into fortuitous mechanism, as some philosophers have done of late, who yet pretend to be Theists and Incorporealists, but only that he .would explain some things in that way. Nay, he clearly puts a difference betwixt Empedocles and the Democritic Atheists, in these words subjoined;[1]" Et<yi Se rivec, &c. which is as if he should have said, " Empedocles resolved some things in -the fabric and structure of animals into fortuitous mechanism; but there are certain other philosophers, namely, Leucippus and Democritus, who w[T]ould have all things whatsoever in the whole world, heaven, and earth, and animals, to be made by chance and the fortuitous motion of atoms, without a Deity." It seems very plain, that Empedo-

[a] Some verses of Empedocles, wherein he expressly maintains that opinion, are extant in JSIian de Natura Animalium, lib. xvi. c. **xxix» [k] Plrysicor. lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 470. oper.**